



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,011	04/12/2005	Immo Benjes	GB 020176	2589
24737 7590 10/15/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
SHERKAT, AREZOO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2431				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,011

Applicant(s)

BENJES, IMMO

Examiner

AREZOO SHERKAT

Art Unit

2431

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CI/CC)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/28/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claimed limitation "generating from the passnumber and the pass-sentence a table having columns in a vertical or horizontal direction and rows in the other direction, in which each word block of the pass-sentence (Zp) is located in a column dependent on the number of preceding word blocks (Zp-1) in the pass-sentence and in a row dependent on the corresponding character (Yp) in the pass-sentence" is ambiguous because the correspondence between character (Yp) and the pass-sentence (Zp) is not clear.

Claims 2-11 are rejected due to their dependency to a rejected base claim.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "approximately equal" in claim 5 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "approximately equal" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

The art rejection is based on Examiner's interpretation of the claimed limitations as currently presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueshima, (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,731), in view of Smith, Jr., (U.S. Patent No. 6,571,336 and Smith hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1 and 8-11, Ueshima discloses a method of validating a user, the method comprising:

associating a pass-sentence (i.e., the generated password associated with the user) comprising a string of word blocks ($Z_1, Z_2.. Z_N$) with the user, associating a passnumber (i.e., user's telephone number) comprising a string of numeric characters ($Y_1, Y_2.. Y_N$) with the user, generating a first table for storing user information such as telephone number and a second table for storing password (col. 10, lines 7-42);

receiving an input, comprising a string of numeric characters, comparing the input to the passnumber, and determining if the input is a valid input on the basis of the comparison (col. 5, lines 1-34).

Ueshima does not explicitly disclose generating a table from the passnumber and the pass-sentence a table having columns in a vertical or horizontal direction and rows in the other direction, in which each word block of the pass-sentence (Z_p) is located in a column dependent on the number of preceding word blocks (Z_{p-1}) in the pass-sentence and in a row dependent on the corresponding character (Y_p) in the pass-sentence and displaying the table.

However, Smith discloses generating a table from the passnumber and the pass-sentence a table having columns in a vertical or horizontal direction and rows in the other direction, in which each word block of the pass-sentence (Z_p) is located in a column dependent on the number of preceding word blocks (Z_{p-1}) in the pass-sentence and in a row dependent on the corresponding character (Y_p) in the pass-

sentence and displaying the table (col. 5, lines 5-65 and col. 8, lines 3-67 and col. 10, lines 17-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Ueshima with teachings of Smith because it would allow generating and displaying a table/grid to securely list passwords as disclosed by Smith. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Smith to enable easy authorized access to the list of passwords (Smith, col. 3, lines 40-43).

Regarding claim 2, Ueshima discloses a method as claimed in claim 1, in which the generating step comprises recalling the table from a storage device (i.e., each access to the table for authentication purposes automatically recalls the table from the storage)(col. 5, lines 1-34).

Regarding claim 3, Ueshima does not disclose wherein the generating step comprises generating the table at random.

However, Smith discloses wherein the generating step comprises generating the table at random (i.e., a randomized MasterGrid)(col. 11, lines 59-67 and col. 12, lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Ueshima with teachings of Smith because it would allow generating and displaying a table/grid to securely list passwords

as disclosed by Smith. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Smith to enable easy authorized access to the list of passwords (Smith, col. 3, lines 40-43).

Regarding claim 4, Ueshima discloses a method as claimed in claim 3, in which word blocks for use in generating the table are stored in a storage device (col. 5, lines 1-34).

Regarding claim 5, Ueshima discloses wherein the number of word blocks stored in the storage device is approximately equal to the number of word block spaces in the table (col. 5, lines 1-34).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see the attached PTO-892 for a complete listing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AREZOO SHERKAT whose telephone number is (571)272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Arezoo Sherkat/
Patent Examiner
Group 2431
Oct. 1th, 2008
/Syed Zia/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431